

Serial No. 09/981,611 Filed 10/16/2001

REMARKS

1. Claim 28 has been amended to include the limitation that the fibrous web is a unidirectionally oriented fibrous web formed by arranging a plurality of parallel filaments. Support for this amendment is found at P. 4, lines 12-14, P. 18, lines 21-23 and Figure 1. As no new matter has been introduced by the amendment it is requested that it be admitted.
2. Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 93/08322.

WO 93/08322 discloses a high strength material made by applying molten polymer particles to a "mat" (P. 2, lines 30-37 and all claims). The term "mat" is defined in WO 93/08322 at P. 4, lines 3-4 as follows:

As used herein, the term "mat" refers to a collection of intersecting fibers to which no binder is applied. (emphasis added)

However, in claim 28 as amended, the fibrous web is unidirectionally oriented and formed of parallel fibers that by definition are not intersecting.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the method of claim 28 differs from, and is patentably distinguished from the prior art of WO 93/08322 by the structure of the fibrous web that is formed. Accordingly, reconsideration of the foregoing rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)/103(a) is respectfully requested.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, whether expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegall Bros v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 2

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580, (CCPA 1974)
3. Claims 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 93/08322.

Serial No. 09/981,611 Filed 10/16/2001

Claims 29 and 30 are directly dependent on claim 28. As claim 28 is submitted to have been shown to be unanticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), reconsideration of the rejection of claims 29-30 is also earnestly requested.

"If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

4. In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the claims now of record, i.e., claims 28-30, are allowable and should be passed to issue. Applicants respectfully request the same. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if there are any unresolved issues to discuss same.

Respectfully submitted,
GARY A. HARPELL ET AL.

By Virginia Szigeti
Virginia Szigeti (Andrews)
Applicants' Attorney
Reg. No. 29,039

Honeywell International Inc.
15801 Woods Edge Road
Colonial Heights, VA 23834
(804) 520-3651

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Patent & Trademark Office via facsimile to Examiner Elizabeth Cole, Group Art Unit 1771, at 571-273-8300 on July 27, 2005.

Virginia Szigeti
Virginia Szigeti (Andrews)